

## FPR NPCLW: Chapter 70 Wilderness Inventory and Evaluation Process

---

### Overview:

#### About the 2012 Planning Rule:

The planning rule provides latitude for using existing direction in place of final directives. The Forest is using the 2007 Chapter 70 Wilderness Evaluation direction and not the 2015 Chapter 70 direction per the following planning rule direction.

The 2012 planning rule does not require the use of the 2013 Draft Chap 70 directives; 1920.3 – Policy

See FSM 1903 for general policy for planning activities.

9. Changes in service-wide planning direction should be carried out as follows:

a. Responsible officials should make changes in preparation and documentation requirements upon issuance of a final directive when a land management plan is developed, amended, or revised. If a plan amendment or a revision has been initiated prior to issuance of the final directive, the responsible official should assess implementation of the final directive given on-going planning schedules and activities. If this assessment determines that a significant disruption to these schedules or activities would occur, the responsible official may choose implementation of on-going planning processes consistent with the 2012 Planning Rule rather than those prescribed in the final directive. However, the responsible official should continue to incorporate the final directive, to extent practicable, through the remainder of the planning process.

#### About the 2007 and 2015 Directives: Chapter 70

The wilderness evaluation process involves two steps - Inventory and Evaluation. There are slight differences in how the directives address the Inventory step; the differences in how the Evaluation step is addressed are greater. To be transparent it is necessary to show how the 2007 information for evaluation translates to the 2015 directive process and determine what, if any, additional data is necessary to bridge the gap between the processes. After meeting with a number of interested citizens and collaborators on this issue, it has become apparent we need to take an approach to bridge the gap in the processes and maintain relevancy and transparency for the process.

Upon selection as an Early Adopter in the Spring, 2012, it was determined that the Idaho Roadless Rule Areas would be the Inventory for wilderness Evaluation; the majority of the IRR areas have undergone evaluation as part of the Draft Forest Plan Revision process under the 2005 Planning Rule. With validation and updating, this 2007 Draft Forest Plan Revision analysis is being used to meet the 2007 Chapter 70 direction for the current revision effort. This data remains relevant and has been validated as part of the assessment process.

#### Background Why are we addressing recommended wilderness in Forest Plan Revision?

*The 2012 Planning Rule directs us, through Chapter 70 direction, to provide an Inventory of unroaded lands that can be Evaluated for wilderness designation.*

1. What management direction should we have for recommended wilderness? What are the two options for recommended wilderness in the Proposed Action; what are Special Management Areas (SMAs) and what management direction was included in the Proposed Action for these?

*Please see pages 69 to 72 of the Proposed Action for the explanation of the Options and management direction for recommended wilderness and SMAs (link below)*

[http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprd3807168.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprd3807168.pdf)

2. What did we hear from the public on recommended wilderness?

*Please see Summary of Public Comments (attached); Recommended Wilderness was the focus of thousands of comments regarding which areas should be recommended. John's Creek /Gospel Hump Multiple Resource Area/Rainy Creek, all names for connected roadless areas, outside of Idaho Roadless Rule Areas, came up repeatedly as a request to add these acres to the Inventory for Evaluation for wilderness designation. At the May 30<sup>th</sup> workshop 4 map displays were used to represent the range of public comment related to recommended areas for our discussion.*

### INVENTORY

The inventory process outlined in 71.1 under both directives is very similar but not identical. Since 2012, when the NPCLW revision effort was initiated, the roadless inventory has been mapped and available to the public, portraying the Idaho Roadless Rule Areas as the roadless inventory on the Forest. The Idaho Roadless Rule process was a collaborative public process with the State of Idaho, Federal Land agencies, Counties, and citizens. The Forest believes this process meets the intent of an open, transparent inventory process of unroaded lands.

The procedural summary for the inventory used for the 2007 DRAFT Forest Plan revision can be found at the link below. This data was validated and adjusted to address the slight differences of areas and area naming included in the Idaho Roadless Rule. These differences included the addition of 3 areas on the Nez Perce NF (Gospel Hump Adjacent to Wilderness, Little Slate Creek North and Selway Bitterroot) and 2 areas on the Clearwater NF (Eldorado and Lolo Creek). Pete King, Wendover and Washington areas on the Clearwater NF were not carried forward in the Idaho Roadless Rule.

If you are interested in this detail, the links are provided below.

2007 direction from the previous revision effort can be found here.

[http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400843.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400843.pdf)

The 2012 direction can be found here:

[http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsh/1909.12/wo\\_1909.12\\_70.docx](http://www.fs.fed.us/im/directives/fsh/1909.12/wo_1909.12_70.docx)

Addressing the unroaded areas adjacent to the Gospel Hump Wilderness but not included as Idaho Roadless Rule areas.

These 3 areas have been debated since before the first round of Forest planning and were brought forward in scoping by a number of commenters. It would be prudent to address these areas as directed in the Gospel Hump Multi Resource Development Plan (GHMRDP) in the second round of Forest Planning.. It will bring additional, collaborative support to the inventory and evaluation process and lead to prudent Forest Plan decisions on these areas if we provide a transparent approach that promotes understanding of the GHMRDP direction for these areas.

### EVALUATION

The evaluation process will be structured to address the 5 Measures under the 2015 Chapter 70 Directive. The 2007 Capacity Analysis findings will be brought forward and incorporated into the evaluation process. The 2007 process evaluated Capability, Availability and Need and is the data used in the assessment. The 2007 Capacity Analysis data for all roadless areas evaluated in the 2007 Revision effort can be found at the following link. There is very little difference in the 2007 roadless areas and the roadless areas designated in the Idaho Roadless Rule, one year later, in 2008.

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/nezperceclearwater/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5403279>

### Cross-walking the 2007 Capacity Analysis data into the Evaluation

The 2007 Capability Analysis used 47 questions that targeted the evaluation of wilderness character elements. These elements were very similar to the 5 measures described in the new directives. Validating and transitioning this data to the new directive format appears to be relevant and will provide additional transparency.

The new Chapter 70 evaluation process outlines 5 measures targeted to evaluate suitability of an area for inclusion into the wilderness system. These 5 measures and sub-measures align well with the Capability data from the 2007 effort, with few exceptions.

Table 1 indicates how this data crosswalk will be used and what additional information would be needed to satisfy the intent of the new, more transparent evaluation process.

## FPR NPCLW: Chapter 70 Wilderness Inventory and Evaluation Process

### 2007 to 2015 Directive Chapter 70: Crosswalk Table (Table 1)

The crosswalk is an attempt to demonstrate how the 2007 Chapter 70 process and information translate to the 2015 directive process, and what additional data could be added to the 2007 process to make it more transparent and better aligned with the 2015 process.

While the Forest will continue to use the 2007 Chapter 70 guidance, providing this crosswalk and some additional data to enhance transparency and relevancy was requested by a number of collaborators and commenters.

The detail of the 2007 Capability Analysis the information is available at the links below:

The 2007 Capability Analysis Questions (47) can be found here:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/nezperceclearwater/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprdb5402536>

The 2007 Capability Analysis data for roadless areas on the Nez Perce NF can be found here:

[http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400841.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400841.pdf)

The 2007 Capability Analysis for the roadless areas on the Clearwater NF can be found here:

[http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400839.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5400839.pdf)

<b>TABLE 1: The following “crosswalk” table demonstrates a possible approach for transitioning the 2007 Capability Analysis information to the 5 measure format of the 2015 directives. The questions are not an exact match between the two directive versions and additional, integrated resource information may be needed.</b>	
<b>2007 Capability Analysis</b>	<b>2015 Wilderness Character Evaluation Measures</b>
<b>Evaluating Naturalness</b>	
<b>Natural and Free from Disturbance: Questions 4-8</b>	<b>Measure 1: Evaluate Apparent Naturalness</b>
Questions 15 and 16; and use of RO updated assessment and TWS analysis of underrepresented plant communities; use questions 19 o 22 to address fish and wildlife communities	The composition of plant and animal communities
Questions 4, 5 and 7; incorporate fisheries stronghold population assessment	Area reflects natural ecological conditions
Question 6	Area Improvements
<b>Evaluating Solitude</b>	
<b>Opportunity for Solitude: Questions: 1-3 Natural and Free from Disturbance: #4-8 Provides Challenge and Adventure: #9-11</b>	<b>Measure 2: Evaluate Opportunities for Solitude</b>
Questions 1, 2 and 3	Impacts affecting visitor opportunity

## FPR NPCLW: Chapter 70 Wilderness Inventory and Evaluation Process

<b>TABLE 1: The following “crosswalk” table demonstrates a possible approach for transitioning the 2007 Capability Analysis information to the 5 measure format of the 2015 directives. The questions are not an exact match between the two directive versions and additional, integrated resource information may be needed.</b>	
<b>2007 Capability Analysis</b>	<b>2015 Wilderness Character Evaluation Measures</b>
Questions 9, 10, 11, 17 and 18	Opportunity for primitive and unconfined recreation
<b>Evaluating areas of 5000 acres or less</b>	
Question 12	<b>Measure 3: Evaluate how an area less than 5,000 acres is of sufficient size to make its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable.</b>
<b>Evaluating Special Features and Values</b>	
<b>Special Features: Scientific, Educational or Historical Values: Questions 15-16</b> <b>Scenic Features: Questions 17-18</b> <b>Other Special Features: Questions 23-24</b>	<b>Measure 4: Evaluate the degree to which the area may contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value.</b>
Questions 15 and 16; and use of RO updated assessment and TWS analysis of underrepresented plant communities; use questions 19 o 22 to address fish and wildlife communities; incorporate fisheries stronghold population assessment	Rare plant or animal communities or rare ecosystems.
Questions 17-18	Outstanding landscape features
Questions 15-16	Historic and cultural resource sites.
Questions 15-16	Research natural areas.
Questions 15-16; incorporate watershed assessment data	High quality water resources or important watershed features.
<b>Evaluating Manageability Features</b>	
<b>Manageability: Looking at how manageable the area is overall. Questions: 12-14</b> <b>Manageability – The Extent Of. Questions 39-47</b>	<b>Measure 5: Evaluate the degree to which the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics.</b>
Questions 12-14	Shape and configuration of the area
Question 43	Legally established rights or uses within the area
Question 43	Specific Federal or State laws relevant to being able to protect wilderness characteristics
Question 13 and 44	The presence and amount of non-Federal land in the area
Questions 44 and 45	Management of adjacent lands.

## FPR NPCLW: Chapter 70 Wilderness Inventory and Evaluation Process

TABLE 2: The following table compares the content of the 2007 and 2015 Chapter 70 directives.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FSH 1909.12 - LAND MANAGEMENT PLANNING HANDBOOK</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CHAPTER 70 - WILDERNESS EVALUATION</b></p> <p><b>Amendment No.:</b> 1909.12-2007-1</p> <p><b>Effective Date:</b> January 31, 2007</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>FSH 1909.12 - LAND MANAGEMENT PLANNING HANDBOOK</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CHAPTER 70 - WILDERNESS EVALUATION</b></p> <p><b>Amendment No.:</b> 1909.12-2015-1</p> <p><b>Effective Date:</b> January 30, 2015</p>
<b>INVENTORY</b>	
<p><b><u>71 - IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.....</u></b></p> <p><u>71.1 - Inventory Criteria .....</u></p> <p>    <u>71.11 - Criteria for Including Improvements ...</u></p> <p>    <u>71.12 - Criteria for Potential Wilderness East             of the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian.....</u></p> <p><u>71.2 - Listing and Mapping Potential             Wilderness .....</u></p> <p><u>71.3 - Numbering of Potential Wilderness             Areas .....</u></p>	<p><b><u>71 – INVENTORY OF AREAS THAT MAY BE SUITABLE FOR INCLUSION IN THE NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.....</u></b></p> <p><u>71.1 – Inventory Process.....</u></p> <p><u>71.2 – Inventory Steps and Criteria .....</u></p> <p>    <u>71.21 – Size Criteria .....</u></p> <p>    <u>71.22 – Improvements Criteria .....</u></p> <p>        <u>71.22a – Road Improvements .....</u></p> <p>        <u>71.22b – Other Improvements .....</u></p> <p><u>71.3 – Inventory Documentation .....</u></p>
<b>EVALUATION</b>	
<p><b><u>72 - EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL WILDERNESS.....</u></b></p> <p><u>72.1 - Capability .....</u></p> <p>    <u>72.11 - Additional Capability Characteristics             for Areas East of the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian....</u></p> <p><u>72.2 - Availability .....</u></p> <p><u>72.3 - Need.....</u></p> <p>    <u>72.31 - Factors .....</u></p> <p><u>72.4 - Evaluation and Documentation .....</u></p> <p>    <u>72.41 - Areas East of the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian .....</u></p> <p><u>72.5 - Boundary Adjustment Guidelines .....</u></p>	<p><b><u>72 – EVALUATION.....</u></b></p> <p><u>72.1 – Evaluation of Wilderness             Characteristics.....</u></p> <p><u>72.2 – Documentation for Evaluated             Areas .....</u></p>